

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ARON GEIGER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	4:06CV3055
)	
v.)	
)	
JAMES L. COX JR., et al.,)	MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The parties have stipulated to a continuance of the trial date in this case. The joint motion does not set out any reason it is being sought. Paragraph 11 of the progression order provides that motions for continuances "shall not be considered in the absence of a showing by counsel of due diligence in the timely development of the case for trial and the recent development of circumstances, unanticipated prior to the filing of the motion, which require that additional time be allowed." There may be very good reasons to continue the trial setting in this case, but they are not stated in the motion. I must, therefore, deny the motion, but another may be filed which sets forth the reasons a continuance is needed.

IT THEREFORE HEREBY IS ORDERED,
The motion, filing 40, is denied.

DATED this 25th day of October, 2006.

BY THE COURT:

s/ *David L. Piester*

David L. Piester
United States Magistrate Judge